Historic District Commission

Nowak Room

Exeter Town Office Building

January 19, 21012

Members present: Ron Schutz, Fred Kollmorgen, Nicole Martineau, Planning Board rep. Pete Cameron, Selectman rep. Julie Gilman and Pam Gjettum, Chairwoman

Call Meeting to Order

Chairwoman Pam Gjettum called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm in the Nowak Room in the Exeter Town Office Building.

New Business: Public Hearing

The application of 127 Water Street Realty, Inc. for the proposed construction of a seasonal dock to the rear of the property located at 127 water Street and for repairs /reconstruction of the existing seawall along the subject property (and extending onto the property at 129 Water Street). The subject property is located in the WC-Waterfront Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #72-22. Case #11-27. (*This application was originally scheduled for the December 15th, 2011 HDC meeting and subsequently tabled until the January 19th 2012 meeting pending action by the Zoning Board of Adjustment*)

Ms. Gjettum prefaced the applicant's presentation by saying Mr. Martin was here to ensure his project fits the HDC standards.

Mr. Milton "Sandy" Martin, Jr. introduced himself and his wife, Edda Martin. It was verified the Commission received a letter from the Zoning Board of Adjustment stating their approval of the variance to construct and install a seasonal dock as presented at its December 20, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Martin stated he wished to install a 4'X4' concrete anchor pad and construct a ramp and float that will be attached to the pad (construction detailed plans provided). In accordance with all the necessary permits received, the docking structure will not go in until July and will be removed in November: it will be in place for about 4 months. Mr. Martin stated it is also his intent to repair the existing granite block and stone retaining wall. The wall is deteriorating and the granite blocks will be removed and repositioned; all the original materials will be used

The photographs provided by the applicant were explained to be of the neighboring structure at 139 Water St. The site preparation and structure design at his location are identical and will be installed by the same contractor.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application: seconded by Ms. Gilman. Motion carried.

Further questioning from the members determined there will be no encroachment of Mr. Martin's structure onto the present driveway. There will be a short brick walkway to the cement pad leading to a locked security gate (as depicted in supplied photographs). No decisions have been made on landscape materials.

Mr. Schutz made a motion to approve the application; seconded by Mr. Kollmorgen. Motion carried.

The application of 81 High Street. LLC for proposed new construction and associated exterior improvements at 81 High Street (former Eventide Home). The subject property is located in the R-2 Single family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #71-97. Case #11-26. (This application was originally scheduled for the November 17th and December 15th, 2011 HDC meetings and subsequently been rescheduled for the January 19th, 2012 HDC meeting at the applicant's request.)

Ms. Lynn Monroe, a historic preservation consultant, started off with a PowerPoint presentation on the evolution of the property. The Exeter Historical Society was acknowledged for the photos used in the presentation. Ms. Monroe added the present main house was constructed in 1890 by Charles Folsom and is an excellent example of Victorian architecture in the Queen Anne style. Emma Folsom, a daughter of Charles, lived in the house and when she passed on in 1943 left the home to become the Charles and Judith Folsom Home for retired persons. Two additional structures were added on in the 60's and it was then called the Eventide Home.

It was emphasized the concept is to focus on the house and the carriage house. This project will create fourteen (14) residential rental units for people over 55 years of age. The exterior of the house will not change and every effort will be made to maintain/restore the interior which is in excellent shape for all its many residents over the years. The windows in the main house will remain. The flat roof on the present rear addition will change to a low hip roof; partly for esthetics but to also house the mechanics. The construction of a nine (9) bay garage will be added on the west side.

Mr. Steven Wilson, owner of the property discussed in detail more of the proposed renovations: details on windows, covering the cinder block rear (south) addition and chimney with clapboards/veneer on chimney, replacing the large Kalwall translucent panel in the rear (south elevator) with multi-mulled windows. The east elevation shows proposed projecting balconies for the 2nd floor units. Mr. Wilson did state any discrepancies in the renderings and the drawings will be addressed in the final construction drawings.

A six foot high privacy fence will be installed on the west property line. As it approaches High St. it will scallop down to four feet and end approximately 30 feet from the sidewalk.

Mr. Wilson continued the discussion on the proposed renovations to the carriage house. Mr. Schutz noted the renovations sounded very nice but because there were not accompanying design/drawings the HDC could not include the approval for the carriage house in this

application; that would need to be deferred. Mr. Wilson said he had no problem coming back with more information in seeking approval.

In discussing the signage and the design and if that was to be covered in the approval of this application, it was agreed to defer that as well until more details are finalized.

Responding to a question, Mr. Wilson affirmed there will be a thorough code review by the Fire Department. And as for meeting ADA requirements, Mr. Wilson replied that more than half the units will meet ADA requirements and as well as the inclusion of an elevator.

Mr. Cameron commented on the series of car port bays that appeared on a previous site plan but did not appear on this application. Mr. Wilson explained that through a series of meetings with the Planning Board and Planning Department and working with their questions and comments the car ports are now lined parking spaces. He did remark that with these sessions the concept had improved and retained more historic details. Mr. Cameron, a Planning Board member, agreed the concept/plan had matured in its development since first being presented.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application: seconded by Ms. Martineau. Vote: unanimous.

Mr. Schutz noted at the previous HDC meeting in anticipation of hearing this application it had asked for an opinion from the Heritage Commission. The Heritage Commission did not discuss the 81 High St. project at its last meeting so did the Commission wish to have a comment from that group. Ms. Gilman felt comfortable with proceeding and Mr. Schutz noted an approval was not being sought on renovations to the carriage house so he too felt comfortable moving on.

Following the vote to accept, the application moved into the approval process. The Chair asked if there were any questions or comments from the public.

Ms. Cassandra Rodier, a resident at Emerson Commons spoke of her concern with the proposed fence extending from the back edge of the carriage house down to High St. The 6' fence would block their view of the carriage house and up to High St. and as she described it as their front yard. Her concern with the fencing near High St. was more of a safety issue than esthetics; felt the line of sight was compromised. Mr. Wilson stated this had been discussed at a number of Planning Board meetings but was willing to address the concerns. He stated his position for locating the fence and noted he had set the fence back from the property line following a discussion at the Planning Board. Further discussion with the owner, Ms. Rodier and Commission members resolved that the fence be reduced to a 4 foot height starting at the rear corner of carriage house and extending approximately twenty-two feet; it then would return to the proposed 6 feet.

Mr. Ernest Podrasky, 86 High St. questioned the size of the balconies, the patios and lighting on the east side of the brick building and also the intended color of the exterior of the main house. Mr. Wilson stated the cantilevered balconies extended about 4 feet from the building; the patios at the lower level are walk-outs with no railings and the lights will have frosted shields. The exterior house color will be from the suggested historic color palate; a shade of green. Mr.

Podransky thanked Mr. Wilson for his patience and felt the project had matured from its initial presentation.

Mr. Kollmorgen moved to accept the application with the following stipulations: *the southernmost twenty-two feet of fence will be at the reduced height of four feet, approval for replacement of the Eventide sign to be tabled, approval for the modifications to the carriage house be tabled.* Mr. Schutz seconded.

Ms. Martineau had some questions on roof lines and pitch of proposed roofs as shown on the elevations. She and Mr. Wilson exchanged suggestions and explanations for the proposed design. With a resolution, Mr. Wilson noted the architectural change will be in the final drawings.

Ms. Martineau had further questions on the size/pitch of the dormers/diverters over the balconies on the east side. It was determined they were false dormers and after discussion with Mr. Wilson and Ms Munroe, Mr. Wilson agreed to increase the pitch to match the existing front hip angles.

And Ms. Martineau did wish to confirm the new window trim will match the existing trim. Mr. Wilson confirmed it would.

From the discussion on roof angles Mr. Kollmorgen wished to add an additional condition to his motion: *to extend the length of the ridge line by twenty-two feet* (on the roof over the rear addition) *and the pitch to match the existing hip angle of the roof on the carriage house*. Mr. Schutz re-seconded. Vote carried with Mr. Cameron abstaining. He had concerns on the fencing decision. In discussion with Mr. Wilson on the final design, Mr. Cameron stated he was satisfied and asked his vote be in the affirmative.

In response to Mr. Cameron's question, it was re-affirmed the HDC is not waiting any further comment from the Heritage Commission. Ms. Gilman added the Heritage Commission may ask for documentation for the carriage house but the application for the main house has now been approved.

Other Business

• Approval of minutes of December 15, 2011

Ms. Gilman motioned to accept the minutes as presented; seconded by Mr. Cameron. Vote: unanimous with Ms. Martineau abstaining as she was not present.

With no other business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Ginny Raub Recording Secretary